

### Remarks

Applicants propose amending claims 1 and 21 to provide that flowable material is injected through a nozzle that is in direct engagement with a molding chamber having a mold cavity. Support for the amendment is found on page 10, last paragraph. No new matter has been added.

Applicants propose amending claims 1 and 21 to place them in condition for allowance. The amendment introduces a new element in the claims though only to more clearly articulate a feature that has been previously argued as a basis for patentability. Hence, the amendment will not require a new search or undue consideration by the Examiner. Applicants submit that good cause exists to enter the amendments even though presented after final rejection since the amendments place the case in condition for allowance.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 6-10 and 137 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,669,883 (“Rosenberg et al.”). The Examiner asserts that the cited reference teaches the claimed process. The Examiner rejects claims 2-5, 11, 12, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Rosenberg. The Examiner rejects claims 14-19 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,177,125 (“Voss”). All of the rejections are premised on the assertion that the extrusion shown in Rosenberg is readable on injecting a flowable material through a nozzle as recited in the base claims. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 1 and 21 provide that flowable material is injected through a nozzle that is in direct engagement with a molding chamber having a mold cavity. Injection molding requires that a nozzle inject materials directly into a mold chamber, or in other words, the nozzle directly engages with the mold chamber. The provision of intermediate flow channels between the nozzle and mold chamber would still be considered a direct engagement since the flowable materials simply flows through the confines of such a device. Rosenberg does not disclose an extrusion other than to say such could be used in combination with the counter-rotating molding wheels. Nonetheless, an extrusion system would not be injecting flowable material directly into the

equivalent of a mold chamber contemplated in Rosenberg or otherwise have a nozzle that directly engages with the mold chamber as required by the claims.

For these reasons, Applicants submit that Rosenberg, the primary reference, upon which all of the rejections are based, fails to disclose an essential feature of the inventions herein. Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw her rejections of the pending claims.

Though the arguments in this response have been limited to single point, Applicants do not waive or concede that the references disclose all of the features set forth in the Office Action or that the references can be combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner. The arguments have been narrowly tailored to allow for a focused, timely review by the Examiner. Furthermore, Applicants submit that the dependent claims present separate and distinct grounds for patentability and reserve our rights to argue them separately in the future.

Applicant further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative if minor amendments will further prosecution towards issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /David R. Crichton/ \_\_\_\_\_  
David R. Crichton  
Reg. No. 37,300

Johnson & Johnson  
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza  
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003  
(732) 524-6131  
Dated: October 3, 2005